

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

JAMMIE JERMAINE SHIELDS,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	No. 3:20-cv-805-E
	§	
UNKNOWN JUDGE, 301st DISTRICT	§	
COURT, ET AL.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case. An objection was filed by Plaintiff. The District Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which objection was made, and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error.

The District Court does observe that, to the extent Plaintiff names additional defendants in the amended complaint who may not technically be employees of the state court clerk's office, *see* Dkt. No. 5 at 6, he alleges no facts specific to these defendants, *see id.*, and has thus not shown the Court that any defendant named who is not a judge was performing "routine duties *not* explicitly commanded by a court decree or by the judge's instructions," *Clay v. Allen*, 242 F.3d 679, 682 (5th Cir. 2001) (emphasis added). The immunity analysis in the findings, conclusions, and recommendation therefore applies to all defendants.

Accordingly, finding no error, the Court ACCEPTS the Findings, Conclusions,

and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge.

Plaintiff, without leave, has filed a second amended complaint. To the extent the Court should consider it, it does nothing to cure the deficiencies noted in the findings, conclusions, and recommendation.

SO ORDERED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2020.



---

ADA BROWN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE